

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

In re AIDAVEL LOZANO LAIGO.

CASE NO. MC05-0201JLR

ORDER

Plaintiff Aidavel Lozano Laigo frequently files civil complaints and other papers with the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. On December 8, 2005, the court entered an order imposing standing litigation restrictions on Ms. Laigo. (12/8/05 Order (Dkt. # 1-1).) The court's standing litigation restrictions on Ms. Laigo provide, *inter alia*:


If the court determines that the complaint meets the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), it will direct the clerk to assign a civil case number and issue summons. If the complaint does not meet the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), the court will enter an order declining to treat the case as a civil action.

(Standing Litig. Restrictions (Dkt. # 1) at 1.)

1 In her latest proposed complaint, filed on January 24, 2024, Ms. Laigo alleges
2 unspecified acts of discrimination by the Social Security Administration, the Department
3 of Health and Human Services, Seattle Public Utilities, and Seattle City Light. (1/24/24
4 Prop. Compl. (Dkt. # 134) at 1-2.) Ms. Laigo alleges that she has given Defendants
5 “enough time to fix their mistakes” but Defendants ignored her. (*Id.* at 1.) She also
6 asserts that Defendants “violated rights of the plaintiff and violated [the] accountability
7 rule and [that] violations of these matters fall under discrimination.” (*Id.*) She does not
8 allege any facts to support a claim for discrimination. (*See generally id.*) Ms. Laigo
9 included with her proposed complaint copies of bank statements and bills from Seattle
10 City Light and Seattle Public Utilities. (*See generally* Exhibit (Dkt. # 134-2).) She does
11 not, however, explain the significance of these documents to her purported claim. (*See*
12 *generally* 1/24/24 Prop. Compl.)

13 Having reviewed Ms. Laigo’s proposed complaint, and pursuant to the court’s
14 standing litigation restrictions, the court declines to treat Ms. Laigo’s proposed complaint
15 as commencing a civil action because she has failed to comply with the notice pleading
16 requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). The court DIRECTS the Clerk not
17 to calendar, take any other action, or file any further pleading in this matter other than a
18 notice of appeal.

19 Dated this 25th day of January, 2024.

20
21 

22 JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge